

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are present in this application. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. 6,559,419 (Sol et al.). Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claim 7 is rejected over Sol et al. in view of U.S. 5,867,129 (Sauer) and claims 10 and 12 are rejected over Sol et al. further in view of U.S. 5,390,595 (Cutcher).

The drawings are also objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing the covering comprising slot antennas tuned to the communication radiation through the communication window. Applicants refer the examiner to Figure 1 which shows slots 7 in the covering 6. As described in the substitute specification on page 9, the slots can be tuned to the characteristics of the communication radiation through the window. It is respectfully submitted that the drawings show all the features recited in the claims, and no change to the drawings is needed.

The Applicant greatly appreciates the interview conducted between his representative and Examiner Patel on March 7, 2010. During the interview Applicant's representative explained the invention as recited in claim 1. As stated in claim 1, the substrate has a coating, a window is made in the coating, an electrically conducting element is in contact with at least one part of the edges of the window in contact with the coating, the window is provided with a covering electrically connected to the conducting element, and the covering has a plurality of interruptions in the window. Reference was made to the non-limiting example of Figures 1 and 2. Figures 1 and 2 show a coating 2 having a window 5. A current collecting strip 4 is disposed on coating 2 near one edge of the window 5 (see Figure 2). A conductive covering 6 is provided in the window and contains openings 7 (see Figure 2) in the window. Strip 4 is electrically connected to covering 6. Applicant's representative pointed out that all of these elements have not been identified in the Office Action.

Applicant's representative then went through the various elements disclosed by Sol et al. as detailed in the Office Action which are asserted to correspond to the elements of the substrate of claim 1. The Office Action identifies the heatable coating as elements 3a-3c, at least one communication window as deletion 4d (as well as 4a-4c) and the electrically conducting element as bus bar portions 7b, 7c and 7d. The Office Action also identifies bus bar portion 7b-7d as the electrically conducting covering and the covering 7b-7d having a plurality of interruptions 4a, 4b and 4d..

Applicant's representative pointed to the internal inconsistency in the rejection. Openings 4a, 4b and 4d are not in the bus bar portion 7 (considered to the covering) but are deletions in the coating 3. The covering of claim 1 has a plurality of interruptions in the window. As discussed during the interview, bus bar portions 7 do not have a plurality of interruptions in a window. If the window is considered to be any of 4a, 4b, 4c or 4d, Figure 2 of Sol et al. clearly shows that the bus bar portions 7a, 7e and 7f are continuous (i.e., there are no interruptions) over deletions 4a-4c. Bus bar portions 7b, 7c, 7d and 7g surround deletion 4d. If the area surrounded by bus bar portions 7b, 7c, 7d and 7g is considered to be an interruption over the deletion 4d, this still does result in an electrical conducting covering having a plurality of interruptions in the window as recited in claim 1.

It is clear from Figure 2 of Sol et al. that there is no covering having a plurality of interruptions in a window in a coating. There is no covering shown in Figure 2 in the window having a plurality of interruptions. As mentioned above, the bus bar portions 7, identified as the covering, have no interruptions over the deletions 4a-4c, and does not have a plurality of interruptions over deletion 4d. Sol et al. does not disclose the substrate of claim 1, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 over Sol et al. is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected over Sol et al. and Sauer. Sauer discloses slots in the heatable coating, which, when combined with Sol et al., would suggest providing slots in the coatings

3a-3c. There is thus no teaching in any cited reference of providing slots in a covering over a window tuned to communication radiation as recited in claim 7. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is also in order.

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected using Cutcher cited to teach conductive ink printed on a substrate. However, even if such teachings were combined with Sol et al., the rejection is still deficient for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. The combination of Sol et al. and Cutcher clearly fails to disclose or suggest the substrate of claims 10 and 12.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Carl E. Schlier
Registration No. 34,426